

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Examining ‘institutional entrepreneurship’ in healthcare redesign and improvement through comparative case study research: A study protocol
AUTHORS	Melder, Angela; Burns, Prue; Mcloughlin, Ian; Teede, Helena

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Pavel Ovseiko Oxford University, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	04-Mar-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a comprehensively thought out and well written protocol for the doctoral research study focusing on the implementation of the sector-wide approach in one healthcare service in the given Australian jurisdiction. The doctoral study is nested within an ongoing larger parent study which has been peer-reviewed as part of an open competition for funding from a recognised research-funding body and has received formal ethical approval. This ensures the high quality of the study proposal, but also puts limits on the extent to which the current study design and methods can be altered. Taking this into consideration, I recommend that this protocol is accepted for publication with the following discretionary changes, mainly focusing on strengthening the rigour of the current study design.</p> <p>Given that the doctoral study will be predominantly qualitative, it is important to conduct and report it using rigorous guidelines, such as the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research (COREQ) recommended by BMJ Open. Adherence to the guidelines can improve the quality of research. For example, the protocol mentions that as an “in-service researcher”, the lead author faces the issue that her position may influence and bias the data collection and analysis. The COREQ requires that all authors reflect on their positions and experience that might influence the way they interpret data. I suggest that the authors specify in the protocol which guidelines they are going to use for qualitative research.</p> <p>It is justifiable that the study draws on institutional theory. However, institutions are the highest-order theoretical constructs, but it is not apparent from the protocol how these are going to be operationalised using lower-order theoretical concepts, e.g. organisational culture, accountabilities, funding and governance arrangements, national policies. The latter are particularly important because the Australian National Innovation and Science Agenda (NISA) and the NHMRC policy to create Advanced Health Research and Translation Centres (AHRTCs) and Centres for Innovation in Regional Health (CIRH) are likely to have influenced this research and potentially its results can maximise the effectiveness of these policies. For example, the</p>
-------------------------	--

	<p>last/senior author is the Executive Director of an AHRTC in the given setting.</p> <p>The authors may want to draw on the relevant international literature to maximise generalisability of the results of their study. Here are some examples from the UK which also have reverences to the wider international literature: https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6963-14-24 https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12913-014-0552-y https://journals.lww.com/academicmedicine/Abstract/2010/08000/Organizational_Models_of_Emerging_Academic_Health.11.aspx https://bmchealthservres.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12913-014-0673-3 https://journals.lww.com/academicmedicine/Fulltext/2012/06000/Organizational_Culture_in_an_Academic_Health.14.aspx https://health-policy-systems.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12961-017-0237-1</p> <p>As someone with research interests in gender equality in STEMM, I would like to encourage the authors to consider incorporating into their study a gendered innovation perspective (see e.g. https://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu/). For example, female leaders tend to have more collaborative leadership styles, but are currently under-represented as leaders and entrepreneurs. Accelerating women’s advancement and leadership in the given setting may contribute to healthcare redesign and improvement in line with the goals of two Australian national programs: Science in Australia Gender Equity (SAGE) and Male Champions of Change STEM.</p> <p>Finally, one of the rationales of publishing a study protocol is to ensure that the results of the study are published too. A lot of doctoral research never gets published creating research waste. Also, doctoral research provides doctoral students with the opportunity to publish first-author papers, increasing chances of their career advancement. Therefore, I would like to encourage the authors to specify in the ethics and dissemination section the research outputs that they are planning to publish and perhaps incorporate them as milestones in the Gantt chart (Figure 2).</p> <p>Overall, it is a comprehensive and well-written protocol for an important and potentially impactful study. I look forward to reading the results of the study.</p>
--	---

REVIEWER	Mauro Romanelli University of Naples Parthenope, Department of Business and Economics, Napoli, Italy
REVIEW RETURNED	03-Apr-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	The study is interesting, original, well structured and organized. The efforts of the authors is very appreciable. Research questions and aims are clearly identified. Results are coherent with research design and methodology. The topic the authors approach is full of managerial, theoretical and practical implications.
-------------------------	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

BMJ Open - Decision on Manuscript ID bmjopen-2017-020807

Examining ‘institutional entrepreneurship’ in healthcare redesign and improvement through comparative case study research: A study protocol

Editorial/Reviewers comments	Author response
Editorial Request: <hr/>	
<p>Please go through the SRQR or COREQ checklist and make sure that all relevant items have been reported in your manuscript.</p> <p>http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/coreq/</p> <p>https://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/</p>	<p>The COREQ checklist has been completed, with relevant matters incorporated into the manuscript. The checklist is attached as an appendix to this document.</p>
Reviewers' Comments to Author: <hr/> Reviewer: 1 <p>Reviewer Name: Pavel Ovseiko</p> <p>Institution and Country: Oxford University, UK</p> <p>Competing Interests: None declared</p>	
<p>This is a comprehensively thought out and well written protocol for the doctoral research study focusing on the implementation of the sector-wide approach in one healthcare service in the given Australian jurisdiction. The doctoral study is nested within an ongoing larger parent study which has been peer-reviewed as part of an open competition for funding from a recognised research-</p>	<p>The authors receive these remarks with thanks and have considered all suggestions; we have taken appropriate actions in response.</p>

funding body and has received formal ethical approval. This ensures the high quality of the study proposal, but also puts limits on the extent to which the current study design and methods can be altered. Taking this into consideration, I recommend that this protocol is accepted for publication with the following

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Pavel Ovseiko University of Oxford, UK
REVIEW RETURNED	22-May-2018
GENERAL COMMENTS	Thank you for the revised version of the manuscript. It comprehensively addresses my previous comments and suggestions. I recommend that it is accepted for publication as it is and look forward to reading the results of this important and potentially impactful research project.